

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on Regulations Relating to Passenger Carriers, Ridesharing, and New Online-Enabled Transportation Services.

Rulemaking 12-12-011 (Filed December 20, 2012)

E-MAIL RULING GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Dated June 23, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ROBERT M. MASON III

Robert M. Mason III

Administrative Law Judge

166166718 - 1 -

R.12-12-011 RIM/ge1

From: Mason, Robert

Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 8:55 AM

To: Mark Gruberg

Cc: ALJ Docket Office; ALJ Process; ALJ STAR

Subject: E Mail Ruling Granting Motion for extension of time

Mr. Gruberg:

This e mail ruling grants the San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance's motion for an extension of time for all parties to serve and file Opening and Reply Comments in response to the ACR on the concept of personal vehicles. Opening comments are now due by July 11, 2016. Reply comments are now due by July 25, 2016.

Please forward this e mail to the service list as I am out of the office until June 27, 2016.

DOCKET OFFICE SHALL FORMALLY FILE THIS RULING.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 22, 2016, at 10:19 AM, Mark Gruberg < mark1106@att.net > wrote:

Judge Mason:

The San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance (SFTWA) submits this motion for an extension of time for all parties to serve and file Opening and Reply Comments in response to the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Inviting Party Comments on the Concept of Personal Vehicles. SFTWA requests a two-week extension for each filing. If granted, the due date for Opening Comments would be July 11, and for Reply Comments, July 25.

The reason for the request is an exceptionally heavy workload at this time. SFTWA is following a number of bills in the state legislature relating to TNCs or taxis, at least five of which are having hearings this week or next. (One bill deals with the same subject matter as the request for comments.) In addition, we are engaged in a number of local issues in San Francisco. All of our Board members work in the taxi industry, most as cab drivers, and none are compensated for our union work. We have no outside help in preparing our submissions.

Rule 11.6 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure allows a motion of this nature to be made orally, by email or in writing. Therefore, we are not serving the motion on other parties. We did, however, contact all parties by email, informing them of our intention to make this motion and asking for agreement to the motion.

At your request, we contacted the following active parties to see if they wished to join in the motion:

Lyft; Rasier-CA (Uber); San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; TechNet; CAL Innovates; Taxi and Paratransit Association of California; Luxor Cab; National Resources Defense Council; Christopher Dolan; Ed Healy; HopSkipDrive.

We asked all parties to contact us by Tuesday, June 21 if they agreed to or opposed the motion. We have received responses only from Uber and Lyft. Each said they had no objection to the motion so long as it applied to all parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Gruberg San Francisco taxi Workers Alliance 415-606-1106 mark1106@att.net